



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/693,516

10/23/2003

Murli Satagopan

MS306229.01/40062.0217US0

2199

27488 7590 09/16/2009
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

PHAN, TUANKHANH D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2163

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/16/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/693,516
Filing Date: October 23, 2003
Appellant(s): SATAGOPAN ET AL.

Robert A. Kalinsky
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 06/11/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 6/16/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Lui et al. ("Interoperability of Peer-to-Peer File Sharing Protocols," August 2002)

Low et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,206,304 B2. Date: Apr. 17, 2007

Boyle et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,782,847 Date: Feb. 16, 1999

Huitema et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,065,587 B2. Date: Jun. 20, 2006

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-10, 23, 25, 28-30, 32, 34, 35, 37 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui et al. ("Interoperability of Peer-to-Peer File Sharing Protocols", August 2002), hereinafter Lui, and further in view of Low et al. (US Pat. 7,206,304), hereinafter Low.

Regarding **claims 1 and 7**, Lui discloses a file sharing method stored on a computer system peer one through a computer system peer two connected in a network environment (p. 25, ¶ 2; Figure 4; p. 29, ¶ 2) comprising:

storing at the second computer system an identity information file from the first peer, the said identity information file comprising a set of interfaces identifying a principal and machine location of the first peer system (p. 29, ¶ 2);

receiving at a user interface implemented on the second computer system the request for access to documents stored on the first computer system and intercepting at the second computer system a request for access to document files when the request is directed to the user interface (p. 33, ¶ 1);

sending request for access to document files to the machine location of the first peer system (Figure 4; p. 29, ¶ 2).

While Lui discloses an interface to accept a user's input for accessing and connecting another in which it is inherent that a user interface is no difference, Lui does not explicitly disclose replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location;

However, in the same field of endeavor, Low discloses replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle of the request with the machine location (i.e. identifying by a name that can be resolved into the corresponding IP address, wherein the corresponding IP and domain name can have a telephone number (abstract; col. 14, lines 20-55; col. 5, ll. 35-40, col. 10, ll. 35-55. While it is inherent that resolving a name to and IP address always provides a seamless replacement to one of ordinary skill in the art, it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the resolving of an alphanumeric string into IP address for location of a machine taught by Low into the identifying the other location

Art Unit: 2163

taught by Lui to give an adaptation of name services into IP address in spite of letting the other party see one's IP address, so that retrieving and mapping to the corresponding service resource is a simplicity for the client's side.

Regarding **claim 3**, the method of claim 1 above and Lui further discloses wherein the peer location comprises an IP address to discover other peers (p. 26, ¶ 3).

Regarding **claim 5**, the method of claim 1 above and Lui further discloses wherein the peer location comprises a principal-initiated request (Figure 3; p. 28, ¶ 2).

Regarding **claim 6**, the method of claim 1 and Lui further discloses further comprising an initial step of receiving at the second computer system the identity information document from the first computer (p. 25, ¶ 2; Figure 3; p. 28, ¶ 2).

Regarding claims 9,, Low further teaches the user-friendly handle comprises a telephone number and telephone call (abstract).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 7 above and Lui further discloses wherein the machine location comprises an IP address (p. 26, ¶ 3).

Claims 23, 30, 34 and 35 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 1 and 7 above.

Claims 25, 32, and 37 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 3 above with reference to discussion of claim 1.

Regarding claims 28 and 29, Lui and Low teach a method of claim 23 above receiving identity and right to access documents from a first user in a networking environment (abstract).

Regarding **claim 42**, Low further teaches wherein authentication server comprises more than one machine location for principal identified by the user friendly interface (Fig. 14.).

Claims 4, 11-15, 17-22, 26-27, 33-34, 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Low, and further in view of Boyle et al. (US Pat. 5,782,847).

Regarding claims 4 and 11-12, Lui and Low teach a method of claims 1 and 7 above but lack wherein the machine location comprises a public key to determine current machine location. However, in the same field of endeavor, Boyle et al. teach the machine location comprises a public key to determine current machine location (col. 8, lines 50-61; col. 26, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the public key taught by Boyle et al. into the disclosure of Lui and Low to enhance security feature so that authentication of involved parties is measured.

Regarding **claims 13 and 26-27**, the method of claim 11 above, Boy et al. further teaches wherein a Secure DNS server having an encrypted machine name and location (Col. 2, lines 9-13, Col. 8, lines 50-61); converting the public key to the encrypted machine name and to look up the registered machine location for the publishing node on the SDNS (Col. 22); sending the request to access to documents (Col. 20, lines, 2-57).

Regarding **claim 14**, Lui and Low teach the method of claim 7 but lack comprises verifying the authorization of the accessing node to review the requested documents before utilizing the requested documents. However, in the same field of endeavor, Boyle et al. teach verifying the authorization of the accessing node to review the requested documents before utilizing the requested documents (abstract; Col. 20, lines 10-60; Col. 5, lines 13-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the verifying the authorization taught by Boyle et al. into the disclosure of Lui and Low above to, again, enhance security feature so that authentication of involved parties is measured.

Regarding **claim 15**, see discussion of claim 13 above.

Regarding **claims 17-18**, Boyle et al. further teach a method of claim 15 wherein delivering a path location to a principal of the accessing node (Col. 20, lines 10-60).

Regarding **claims 19 and 22**, Lui and Low teach the method of claim 7 but lack identity information document. However, in the same field of endeavor, Boyle et al. teach the resolving step comprises: receiving the request for access to documents when the request is directed to the user-friendly handle (Col. 4, lines 23-65; Col. 24, lines 29-64); finding a matching identity information document having a user-friendly handle that matches the user-friendly handle in the request (Col. 24, lines 29-64); determining the machine location from the matching identity information document (Col. 24, lines 29-64); and amending the request to substitute the user-friendly handle with the machine location (Col. 6, lines 52-64; Col. 24, lines 29-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2163

incorporate the verifying identity information document steps taught by Boyle et al. into the disclosure of Lui and Low above to, verify the exact document intended for the other party so that no mistake in document identity happens.

Regarding claims 20 and 21, see discussion of claim 17 above.

Regarding claims 38-41, Lui and Low teach the process of claim 35 but lack the machine location comprises a public key to determine the publishing node. However, in the same field of endeavor, Boyle et al. teach the machine location comprises a public key to determine current machine location (col. 8, lines 50-61; col. 26, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the public key taught by Boyle et al. into the disclosure of Lui and Low to enhance security feature so that authentication of involved parties is measured.

Claims 2, 8, 16, 24 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lui in view of Low, and in further view of Huitema et al. (US Patent 7,065,587).

Regarding claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 31, and 36, Lui and Low teach limitations of claims 1, 7, 15, 23, 30, and 35, but lack the user-friendly handle comprising an email address.

Huitema et al. disclose a method of accessing between nodes comprising an email address (Col. 15, lines 50-55). Since the use of email address is well known in the art for embedding in strings of datagrams, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the email address taught by Huitema et al. into the teaching of Boyle et al. to increase the accessibility between machine locations. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2163

skill in the art of networking at the time the invention was made to understand TCP/IP protocols and formats, as disclosed by Boyle et al. (abstract), include using email.

(10) Response to Argument

I (Issue): Do Lui et al. in view of Low show or suggest a method of accessing documents stored on a first computer system through a second computer system comprising “receiving at a user interface implemented on the second computer system a request for access to documents stored on the first computer system, the request including the user-friendly handle and being directed to the first computer system” in combination with the features as is required by claims 1, 7, 23 and 35 of the present application?

- In the first argument the Appellants argue that *“the resolution in Low is not implemented by the same computer that implements a user interface that receives the request for access to documents. See Id. Instead, the resolution, including the substitution of the name for the IP address, is done by a separate DNS server. For example, Figure 11 of Low, reprinted below, shows that a DNS lookup requires a separate query, over the Internet 50, to a remote DNS server. As such, Low fails to disclose or suggest resolution of a domain name by the same computer that receives the request. In contrast, claim 1 requires replacing the user-friendly handle at the second computer system, with the second computer system being the system on which the user interface by which the request originates is implemented. The Final Office Action states that the resolution of the IP address using the DNS server does affect implementation of a user interface that allows an input request for access to documents on another*

computer. Final Action, pp. 2-3. However, this statement fails to address the noted distinction between Low and claim 1 - in Low, the resolution is done by a separate entity (a DNS server), while claim 1 requires that the resolution be performed by the same second computer that implements the user interface. The Action fails to identify any disclosure in Low that would suggest such a configuration. The Advisory Action states that the replacement of the machine location is taught by Lui in view of Low to give an adaptation of the name service into an IP address or location so that retrieving and mapping to the corresponding service resource are provided. While the correctness of this statement is not conceded, it is respectfully suggested that the Advisory Action fails to identify what "adaptation" is being referenced."

In response to the first argument, the Appellants' argument has not been found to be persuasive for several reasons:

(1) "receiving at a user interface implemented on the second computer system a request for access to documents stored on the first computer system, the request including the user-friendly handle and being directed to the first computer system" as claimed is no different than sending a link (or the user-friendly handle as claimed) from one computer to another computer so that the another computer user can click on the link and access the requested document.

(2) As the interpretation of the limitation is pointed out (1) above, Lui et al. reference could sufficiently provide the same purpose of the claimed invention by using a Napster service of Gnutella as further explained in page 25, introduction paragraph. While Lui et al. does not explicitly saying a user-friendly handle, the combination of Low

Art Unit: 2163

providing a user friendly handle as a resolution of DNS name of the internet (col. 5, lines 35-40) whereas a DNS name is a link to a website or a link or an IP address name is well understood to one of ordinary skill in the art.

II (Issue): Do Lui et al. in view of Low and further in view of Boyle et al. show or suggest a method of accessing documents stored on a first computer system through a second computer system comprising “delivery of a path name by a telephone call” in combination with the features as is required by claim 18 of the present application?

- In the second argument the Appellants argue that *“Boyle discloses a method for establishing trusted communications between users of an IP-based network. The Action cites column 20, lines 10-60, of Boyle as disclosing the subject matter of claim 18. However, this section of Boyle fails to even disclose a telephone call. In fact, Boyle does not discuss telephone calls at all. Boyle clearly fails to disclose delivery of a path name by a telephone call.”*

In response to the second argument, the Appellants' argument has not been found to be persuasive because Boyle et al. discloses seven layers of a network connection include a session layer whereas a telephone connection is a session layer of the seven layers of a network connection (col. 4, lines 28-32).

III (Issue): Do Lui et al. in view of Low and further in view of Huitema et al. show or suggest a method of accessing documents stored on a first computer system through a second computer system comprising “delivery of a path name by an email” in combination with the features as is required by claim 16 of the present application?

- In the third argument the Appellants argue that *“The Final Action concedes that Lui and Low fail to disclose such a limitation. For the following reasons, Huitema does not*

Art Unit: 2163

overcome the shortcomings of Lui and Low. Huitema discloses a peer to peer name resolution protocol (PNRP) using peer IDs. The peer IDs are resolved using peer address certificates.”

In response to the third argument, the Appellants' argument has not been found to be persuasive because Huitema disclosure cures the shortcomings of Lui and Low by providing a peer ID can be provided based on an email address (col. 15, lines 49-54 of Huitema). In fact, the Appellants seem to agree with the Examiner that Huitema discloses a peer ID can be generated from an email address.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

TuanKhanh Phan

Conferees:

Don Wong, SPE AU 2163

/don wong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2163

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2163

/Mohammad Ali/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2158

Application/Control Number: 10/693,516

Page 13

Art Unit: 2163

TuanKhanh Phan, Examiner AU 2163